Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO   :   Chief, D/GG and D/GC   DATE: 3 May 1961

FROM :   Ch/G/RR

SUBJECT: GM 61-3 (West New Guinea)

1. We have had a response to this GM which said that it was
"too bad that some of the locations highlighted in text were not
on map." A comparison of the text with the maps in this GM has
revealed several discrepancies. Some names appearing in the text
have been omitted from the map and in other cases the form used
in the text has not been repeated on the map.

2. The following is a list of those omissions and discrepancies
which have been observed.

Paragraph 2   South Moluccas: not identified on any map.

Paragraph 4,19,27   Radja Ampat Groep: is given coordinate location but
                              should be named on map.

Paragraph 4   Gebe, island of: identified as one of Radja Ampat Groep
                              but not named; pointed out in text so should be named
                              on map.

Paragraph 6,16(twice)   Meervlakte Depression: is named simply Meervlakte on
                              the map.

Paragraph 7   Arafura Sea: would be desirable to name on main map
                              as it pertains directly to subject matter; it would
                              also be useful to paragraph 18.

Paragraph 9   Bomberai Peninsula: This form is in text, on map it
                              appears as Schiereiland Bomberai.

Paragraph 18   Humboldt-baai: given in text but omitted from map.

Paragraph 24   Moluccas: not on any of the maps.

SECRET

SECRET

SUBJECT: GM 16-3 (West New Guinea)

Paragraph 25   Implication that Biak is town exists in text. Map
                      shows no town by this name. Mokmer is apparently
                      the principal "town" on Biak island. Should text
                      indicate that the island is a site of principal
                      European settlement?

Paragraph 27   Cyclops Mountains: stated to be west of Hollandia but
                      could be on map, especially inset.

     3. It was my understanding at the time that the text of this GM
was approved that all names mentioned in the text would appear on the map.
It is highly desirable that, wherever practical, features mentioned in
the text be located on any accompanying maps and it is regretable that
this has not been done in this case. I should like to have an explanation
of what appears to be lack of correlation between the text and map of
this GM.

25X1A

- 2 -

SECRET

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM

| UNCLASSIFIED | | CONFIDENTIAL | X | SECRET |

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	INITIALS	DATE
1	Ch 66/F	GRW	11 May 61
2	Ch D/AA		
3			
4			
5			
6			

	ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY
	APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION
	COMMENT		FILE		RETURN
	CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE

Remarks:

For info & suggestions

File

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE
D/AA	8 May

UNCLASSIFIED | CONFIDENTIAL | SECRET

FORM NO. 237   Replaces Form 30-4   (40)
1 APR 55   which may be used.   U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1955—O—342531

Dick:

Harvey's "suggestions" are attached. I am generally in agreement with them.

I think we can all agree with Ch/G's observation in para. 3 that "It is highly desirable that, wherever practical, features mentioned in the text be located on any accompanying maps and it is regretable [sic] that this has not been done in this case."

It seems clear that the shortcomings in this case were almost entirely the result of time pressures which made it impossible to permit a systematic and careful check of text/map concordance and proper correction of discrepancies disclosed by such a check. One can reasonably ask, "Why did these time pressures build up, since we had pre-arranged a neat time schedule that would have allowed sufficient time had we adhered to it?" The answer is, simply, that we didn't adhere to it, and for this, I think that both GG/F and D/GC can share responsibility:

1. GG/F took too long in preparation of the draft text and ultimately produced a draft text that was much too lengthy, thus complicating and lengthening the job of reviewing and editing the text.

2. GC/F's first compiler to work on the map spent 3 days before leaving to attend the AAS meetings in Chicago. The GG/F analyst had given the GC/F compiler specific and detailed map requirements before compilation began. Nevertheless, the GG/F analyst was subjected to frequent and lengthy interruptions by the compiler's questions during these 3 days, thus interfering with time that would otherwise have been spent on drafting the text.

3. When the second GC/F compiler picked up the job, it was necessary to do a certain amount of "back-tracking," again necessitating conference with the GG/F analyst and pulling him away from his job of drafting the text.

4. Drafting of the map seemed to be somewhat substandard. The GG/F

analyst found some 35 errors requiring correction when he checked the fair

drawings. This also necessitated a greater-than-anticipated expenditure of

time.

5. There seems to be a tendency on the part of D/GC to overestimate

the amount of time that will be required for reproduction of such high priority

items. In this instance, it was indicated that the job would need to get to

Reproduction by 5 April in order to be finished by 21 April. As a matter of

fact, of course, it did not get to Reproduction until 11 April; yet it was

completed and copies were delivered to Ch/G on 19 April. The concern for allowing

plenty of time for Reproduction is understandable, but the difference noted above

between the time indicated by D/GC as being necessary and the time actually required

for the job is considerable. Of course, with each day that passed after 5 April,

the time pressures were increasing. As it turned out, there would have been

plenty of time for the sytematic final check of map against text, but in the

interests of getting the job to Reproduction without further delay we decided

to ~~skxkximak~~ eliminate that final ~~xxxpxkxp~~ step. We did this with confidence

that any discrepancies that slipped through would be very minor ones. We still

think that they are!

Our only salvation for this type of thing is to <u>require</u> the systematic cross-

check of map and text just before the job goes to Reproduction. In cases where

the deadline is tight, this will require <u>realistic time scheduling</u> and <u>realistic</u>

<u>adherence to the schedules established</u>. Otherwise, we simply have to sacrifice

perfection of product for timeliness of delivery. A less-than-perfect product

delivered on time is more useful than a perfect ~~xpxx~~ product delivered three days

too late.

11 May '61